

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,833	NELSON ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.	1653	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.

(3) Einar Stole.

(2) Agnes Rooke.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: March 10, 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-33, and 39-41.

Identification of prior art discussed: all of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: ES discussed Versluis et al. and argued that that reference teaches a liposomes phospholipid bilayer and not a monolayer particles. KCC pointed out paragraph [0032] of the spec. in which EYPC and cholesterololeate and ApoE3 are taught as solid particles. Thus Versluis et al. appears to teach the monolayer outerlayer even though they call their particle a liposome. ES may wish to point out this discrepancy and/or provide a declaration that the liposomes of Versluis are not monolayer as claimed. Also, ES pointed out that the secondary references do not teach cholesterol conjugates, which KCC and AR tentatively agree. AR will also further review Westesen for art, wherein the plasma LDL may or may not be considered to be an artificial particle. Also, ES pointed out that Claims 28-33 were rejected on the PTO 326 but never addressed in the Office Action. THEREFORE, the previous Office Action will be removed and a new Office Action be written and mailed. .